UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Mankind Before the Bar - - - - - - - - - - - *Stanton A. Coblentz*

The Tragedy of Freedom - - - - - - - - - - - *Edward S. Smith-Green*

Worship and Social Progress - - - - - - - - - - *Herbert Sturges*

The Way to Peace - - - - - *Leo Hirsch*

Toward the Understanding of Protestantism - - - - - *Karl M. Chworowsky*

Political Ring-Around - - *George McLure*

VOLUME CXXXIV NUMBER 4

Chicago, September-October, 1948

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of the Fourth Unitarian-Congregational Church in Brooklyn, New York.

Stanton A. Coblentz: Well-known journalist and author.

Charles A. Hawley: Former minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Atchison, Kansas.

Leo Hirsch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

George McLure: Citizen of Canada.

Edward D. Smith-Green: A native of British Guiana; graduate of Queens College; served ten years with the British Government; now a resident of Brooklyn.

Herbert Sturges: Former teacher in the Cibecue Day School, Cibecue, Arizona.

James M. Yard: Director Emeritus of the Chicago Round Table of Christians and Jews.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 59

ARTICLES—

Mankind Before the Bar—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 60

The Tragedy of Freedom—EDWARD S. SMITH-GREEN 62

Worship and Social Progress—HERBERT STURGES 63

The Way to Peace—LEO HIRSCH 65

Toward the Understanding of Protestantism—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 69

Political Ring-Around—GEORGE MCLURE 70

POETRY—

Mahatma Gandhi—DOLLIE VANDALL BINGMAN 64

Tide of Bayonets—MANFRED A. CARTER 74

THE STUDY TABLE—

Dante in America—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 73

Jewish History—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 73

Cartoons for Grownups, Too—JAMES M. YARD 74

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 75

THE FIELD—

India—*Worldover Press* 58

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

INDIA

By ROBERT ROOT

The land of the late Mahatma Gandhi is hastening to perfect a modern military machine. The speed with which militarization is being undertaken raises anew the question of how far Gandhi's ideas have permeated into the population.

Almost everyone pays tribute to Gandhi's teachings, including non-violence. But a remarkable aspect of the present trend is the scant open opposition. One exception was the response to a proposal for military training as a requirement for graduation from the University of Bombay; there was considerable hostility to this step, some of the objectors pointing out that the revered Gandhi himself could not have received a diploma if enrolled under such rules.

The government recently announced that it will open a national war academy at Kharakavasla, near Poona. Candidates from 15 to 17 are to be admitted on merit. Pending construction of the institution, an inter-service academy will be started next year at Dehra Dun.

Defense Minister Sardar Baldev Singh has announced plans for raising a Territorial Force, to start with 130,000 men, which would be a second line of defense in addition to the regular army. He said that he proposed the formation in answer to "persistent demand" from the people for youth military preparedness.

Projects are also being put forward for military training in the schools. The United Provinces is inaugurating a plan for compulsory military training of all high school students, both boys and girls. Plans call for extending this to all the secondary schools of this large section. The students are to be organized in platoons, and rifles and other military equipment will be used.

Madras province also has a scheme for school military training. In discussing the plan, teachers brought forward the usual alleged advantages of discipline and courage, and some wished to include girls in the undertaking. . . .

—*Worldover Press.*

UNITY

Volume CXXXIV SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1948 No. 4

EDITORIAL

The liberal will render his best service to the mind of the world by maintaining genuinely liberal attitudes and judgments. He will not be swayed by hysteria, for he believes in objective appraisal of events and movements. He will not be victimized by propaganda, for he can distinguish between valid evidence and emotive slogans. He will not leap at conclusions, for he respects logical processes. He knows that there is no single cause of events, and no single solution of problems. He believes that individualistic bigots and collectivistic dogmatists alike menace the minds of people. He fears mass movements, whether of the right or the left, for they do not lend themselves to sane and intelligent judgments. Not even victory for a liberal cause gives satisfaction to a liberal if he knows the victory was won by either physical compulsion or fanatical persuasion. The habit of liquidating opposition by firing squads and gaining ends by appeals to passion is revolting to the liberal, for he believes in the right to differ and in the power of reason. The rigid methods of doctrinaire partisans offend his devotion to the art of conciliation. Specifically the liberal will not be taken in by shouts that social ills in America can be cured by either fencing in Wall Street or fencing out red spies, but he will not ignore evils that arise from these sources. He will oppose the stoning of even false prophets, but he will not approve Messianic agitation unrelated to actualities. He will favor movements toward the setting up of world controls operating under law, and he will set himself against efforts to attain nationalistic ambitions by infiltration and subterfuge. And especially will the liberal stand firmly against the conditioning of rights and duties on race or origin, and he will demand respect for the personality of people everywhere. Such attitudes and judgments are indispensable in a highly complex social and political scene. And the genuine liberal will not merely maintain them in the recesses of his own mind and in his individual contacts, but he will also proclaim them in all possible ways to the whole world. He will count it a distinction to be maligned by bigots and dogmatists, for he will be sustained by a sense of history and an unfaltering trust in the ultimate triumph of the liberal way of life.

Curtis W. Reese.

Mankind Before the Bar

STANTON A. COBLENTZ

Sometimes, amid the commotions of these troublesome years, it has occurred to me to wonder if it is not time for the race of man to pause and take stock. For a long while we have been hearing of the achievements of *homo sapiens,* the "lord of creation"; we have been reading the self-eulogies of our species on its own skill, sagacity, power, energy, perception, and accomplishment; dogmas regarding "progress" have been in the air, and we have glowed with admiration of our scientific and mechanical ingenuity. But is it not time to look, even though briefly, at the balance sheet of history? Is it not time to ask: What, actually, have we accomplished? Was nature on the right track in developing a featherless biped from apelike ancestors? Or did the great force of evolution err, as when it created the dinosaur and the megatherium?

It may be that it is still too early to give a positive answer; that after another million or two million years, when we have developed a wise and coordinated society, it will be possible to reply with certainty. On the other hand, another million or two million years may not be vouchsafed us; indeed, nothing seems more evident than that, unless we alter the direction of our advance, we will not have even another thousand or two thousand years—no, perhaps not another century to blast this planet with steel and fire. The record may already be written in the blood and conflagrations that have reddened half the earth's territory and point menacingly toward the other half. So should we not stand aside and ask ourselves, judiciously and dispassionately: Just what is this race of man? What have we done? How would we look in all-perceiving and unprejudiced eyes?

Of course, it is impossible for any of us to be either all-perceiving or unprejudiced. But we may put aside the veils of our bias long enough to make certain judgments. And just what do we see when we try to look upon our race unemotionally and with perspective? First of all, we observe a swarming mass of individuals, who, on close view, remind us of the proverbial ant—except that, unlike the ant, they are not always industrious, nor do they go their way quietly. Violently opinionated even when well-meaning, with minds patterned in grooves by their early training and with little ability to form individual judgments, they are malleable to the will of any ambitious leader, docile beneath the whip of military authority, and easily inflamed to passion against brothers of a different faith, nationality, or color. The great majority take their religion ready-made and cut to pattern, as an inherited acquisition, just as they take membership in the community of their birth; and, in the same way, they accept the whole inherited code of ideas and superstitions of their social class or group, the exaltation of greed and gold, the blood-letting cult of "honor," the tradition of exploitation, the competition in material extravagance, or whatever other way of life and thought has been bequeathed them. To be sure, they do occasionally submit to change, but only change in which the direct lineage is apparent—as when the horse-drawn carriage is supplanted by the horseless one, or when a surface sea raider gives place to a submarine.

Examined individually, these men and women will prove to be often generous, loving, faithful, courageous, and even wise within the limits of their activities; although, conversely, they frequently show themselves to be narrow, spiteful, cowardly, greedy, designing, or treacherous. But when they are seen in the mass, their virtues seem somehow to retreat. Seen in the mass, they are violent and inflammable; they resort to atrocities of which individually they would be incapable; and—still more significant—they can be trained and herded for objects they do not understand or try to understand, or which they radically misunderstand; and may be welded together into a force capable of overthrowing empires or overshadowing civilizations. And the sad, the discouraging fact is that there is no cause at all which they cannot be made to serve—*no cause at all,* provided that they are taken young enough and their minds are given the proper twist. No monstrousness of rape and destruction, no horrors of massacre cannot be given a golden lining, cannot find active participants and passive condoners by the millions among those very races regarded as the standard-bearers of civilization.

There is, to be sure, a less disheartening side to the picture. Amid the strange, dim, crime-ridden avenues and alleys of history, an occasional brilliant luminary shines—fixed stars amid the constellations of fireflies. Plato and Euripides, Homer, Virgil, Dante, Shakespeare, Sappho, Pindar, da Vinci, Bruno, Galileo, Newton, Spinoza, Kant, Beethoven, Mozart, Lao-tse, Moses, St. Francis, Christ—the list may be extended considerably, but by no means indefinitely. We find here a handful—a few scores, a few hundreds at most—of really civilized men and women. We find here the leaders, who have given our race everything that is beautiful, everything that is wise and knowing, everything that has raised our species above the wild thing cowering in a hole in the ground. Had these persons not lived—these, and perhaps another scattering of the great, whose names have been lost to history—how far would we be above the cave man with his wooden spear? The answer is only too evident!

The average human being accepts the fruits passed down to him by the few, but does not contribute, and often does not understand. How many of us, who have never created the tiniest gadget with our own hands, enjoy the electric light, the radio, the mechanical refrigerator, and scores of other inventions, which we would be unable to conceive or to reproduce were they to be snatched from us? The very smelting of iron, the pumping of water from the soil—for that matter, the successful raising of grain—would be beyond the power of the majority of us moderns, were present-day machines and technique to be obliterated. Nothing, indeed, is more obvious than that the ordinary person, cut in a definite mould, would have continued to hop amid the trees or crawl amid the cave shadows had it not been that the relatively few, gifted with more daring and originality, had built houses, contrived alphabets, devised tools, written epics and sagas, and planted civilization amid the wilderness.

Yet despite these few great leaders, what a record his-

tory presents! Wars, riots, persecutions, massacres—wars, riots, persecutions, massacres—again and again the story chequers the centuries! Kings are crowned, and overthrown; small groups are oppressed by great, and weak by strong; slaves are seized and sold; great men are abused, reviled, and murdered, while ruffians are exalted; traders compete, and die in their own blood, or clutch whole communities or nations in stranglenooses; and all the while countrysides are devastated, homes and farms pillaged, and exiles and refugees weep and perish. This is, it is true, not all that history has to show; but it is a considerable part of the tale. When more splendid patches are visible, too often they are counterbalanced by the red and the black. Rome, for example, gives us an Emperor Marcus Aurelius; but as the son of Marcus it presents us with the monstrous Commodus. It produces the able administration of a Septimus Severus; but the offspring of Septimus is the crimson-drenched tyrant Caracella. It gives us wise laws and a settled state of civilization; but at the same time, it shows corruption so deep rooted that the Emperorship can be auctioned off by the Praetorian Guards and the intriguer rather than the man of merit most often rises to the leadership of the State. And so on throughout most other lands, and all other ages. Man, as his own housekeeper, has been conspicuously unsuccessful. He has been unable to keep his own premises in order for any prolonged period, or over any wide sections of the earth. The stain of blood has been on his doors and altars; the stench of smoke has invaded his council rooms and parlors. And this all for one essential reason: because man, unlike the ant, the bee, and the termite, has not learned how to live with his fellow creatures; because, although a gregarious animal, he has not mastered the art of living gregariously.

This is true, tragically true, of the present age. But in our own day, man's inability to manage his own house evokes a greater irony than ever before. For now we have mastered most of the great forces of nature. The sea and the undersea depths are ours to range; the heart of the atom has fueled us with power to construct or destroy; the bowels of the mountains and the substrata of the plains offer us metals and oil in abundance never before known or imagined. Yet our conquest of nature has put us where? Further than ever from conquering the problems of man. Our very successes with steam and electricity, with gasoline and atomic energy, have obstructed our real progress, which is progress in the relations between human beings; our partial overthrow of external enemies, such as famine and pestilence, has won for us a new and far more dreadful enemy—or rather, has given new weapons to the old enemy, Man.

The facts regarding modern civilization are too well-known to require restatement. Yet, for the sake of completing the picture, let us glance at the outlines. We see a world in which the arts of production have been so well mastered that it would be possible to supply every citizen of the earth not only with the necessities of existence, but even with the superfluities. We see the daily employment of mechanical devices that in any former age would have been regarded as sheer wizardry. We find millions living in luxury beyond the dreams of princes a century ago; and find a material panacea, over large sections of the earth, not only near at hand, but actually attained. Yet reverse the screen, and what do we find? A vulture gnawing at the vitals of our prosperity! Thanks to his very advantages, man blasts his advantages to bits. With bombs and tanks and battleships, with machine-guns and howitzers and flame-throwers, each half of the planet was only recently shattering the other half . . . until plains, forests, and cities lay waste, prison camps overflowed and their inmates fell like flies,—and men, women, and children were massacred by air bombs and in gas chambers. Even today, as a consequence, we live beneath the shadow of catastrophe; even today, famine and destitution stalk throughout wide, once-prosperous areas of Europe and Asia; even today, a large part of the productive capacity of great nations is devoted to one purpose alone: that of slaughter and destruction, or of protection against expected slaughter and destruction. And in the face of devastating powers immensely more potent than ever known before; in the face of our ability to use the very energy at the core of matter and the certainty that we will employ it if the occasion appears, we are unable to take any effective remedies against future conflict, our conferences break up amid mutual recriminations, and few seem to face boldly and clearly the inescapable fact that major warfare and annihilation must henceforth be synonymous.

Certainly, a black picture! a picture that might cause some outside observer to cry in despair, "A doomed planet!" But are we really the inhabitants of a doomed planet? As I remarked in the beginning, it is still impossible to say. But there is one thing we can say—and say with positiveness. This is, that unless man can conquer man—unless he can govern the furies of prejudice and passion, hatred, and selfish ambition within the breast of man—then we may be sure that nature has erred in her experiment in creating the *genus homo*. It may still not be too late to check the forces of disintegration; but unless we can meet the test, and meet it soon, there may be nothing ahead but ashes and darkness. Man's powers of destruction—as one can observe from the present decayed state of a large part of Europe—are greater than his talents for construction; and, unless counteracted, these powers of destruction will grow, and will, moreover, continue to be wielded by leaders who laugh at any restraint other than that of iron force.

But perhaps this is just as well, one may sardonically add. Perhaps it is just as well that the slate may be wiped clean, so that some fitter and less quarrelsome species, whether the offspring of bats, beavers, or mice, should at length take supremacy over the earth. Yet I for one, remembering that there is an angel as well as a fiend in the heart of man—remembering that our race has produced not only Caligula and Ivan the Terrible but Confucius, Gautama, and Jesus—I for one cling to the hope, though it seem a forlorn one, that man's better genius may triumph. And because I believe that we stand near the great and perhaps the final climax; because I feel it essential to see our race in perspective before we take our next stride into the mists; because I hold that excess of confidence in one's species may be as dangerous as excess of confidence in one's country in wartime, I have attempted to draw, even though briefly and inadequately, this portrait of humanity as history seems to show it. For if we can once look upon man as he is, we may be able to divert the pistol that he points at his own heart.

The Tragedy of Freedom

EDWARD D. SMITH-GREEN

The task of portraying the interplay of forces and incidents responsible for the reciprocal conduct, and the relative positions, of the white and Negro peoples of America has been attempted several times in the past. But this writer's decision to follow in the wake of his predecessors is based on the conviction that, in view of the tremendous changes now taking place in our national economy, a new orientation, by both races, to the profound philosophy of American democracy is imperatively necessary.

That necessity becomes daily more urgent to every American who is proud of his heritage of freedom. For it is being recognized, more and more, that in order that his country may remain free, and "maintain its further advance in the direction of its appointed end, it is necessary that it should secure...the freedom of every individual citizen, whatever his merits may be"; that "there can be no real freedom without justice, and no security for justice except freedom."

When one realizes that justice and freedom "are mutually interdependent; that they have no separate interests; and that the values of both are equal, and rest on a common ground," then comes the recognition of the tragedy of freedom in the spectacle of the suppression of the liberties of fifteen million people of African descent in America. And it is because of this recognition that the question of the Negro's right to the privileges of citizenship is now engaging the minds of patriotic Americans.

The question of the Negro's place in the American Republic, and his relation to the social order, is one that has agitated many brilliant minds for centuries. The hypothesis of his predestined role of perpetual servant unto his brethren has become an established principle of human conduct. There can be no doubt as to the traditionary error of this assumption. In the progress of human relations, other concepts and assumptions, which reflected the mental processes of Man during the successive stages of his development, were considered merely as efforts at explanation of certain phenomena when, upon a re-examination of the generalized conclusions, it was found they conflicted with advanced thought. The reinterpretation of the earlier hypotheses, and a redefinition of terms, sufficed to clarify the involuntary errors of a previous day. But the myth which created the Negro an outcast, branded with the unclean blemish of the world's social leper, has continued to influence the destiny of a whole race of people because, classified as outside the domain of scientific investigation, it has been completely isolated from the rigid standards by which other hypotheses are adjudged susceptible of proof.

The phenomenon of the perpetuation of this irrational concept by those who today play so large a part in the development of our social institutions constitutes one of the most persistent and characteristic features of modern society. In all the phases and incidents of our evolving social structure, our national development has been influenced, to a considerable extent, by the still prevailing belief in the justice of the social disfranchisement of the Negro. It is true that the condition of inequality between groups within the body politic was the inevitable result of every growing civilization; but in none of them was sanction for the endless duration of that condition sought and found in the divine commands of Deity.

Herein lies the importance of the question of the Negro's relation to the social system of which he is a part. In the new approach towards a better understanding of the purpose of his being, is he to continue the victim of those inherited concepts which, although repudiated by subsequent developments are, nevertheless, still accepted by a large portion of American society as the explanation of the phenomenon of his ostracism?

To one studying this remarkable period of change in our social organization comes the idea that he is witnessing the operation of an evolutionary force which, because of its all-pervading influence, is reconstituting and reorientating the elements of society. The drift of this movement is, apparently, towards the complete social enfranchisement of the masses of the people, and the creation of those hitherto denied opportunities for participation in the struggle for existence on the terms of equality of opportunity.

The experience of the Negro has been, in the past, systematic exclusion from participation in similar movements. The fact of his previous condition of servitude was seized upon as the explanation for the erection of rigid social barriers against his unrestricted entry into the scheme of American life. This attitude has become a fixed principle, and has led to the imposition of those legal and political disabilities which ban him from full participation in the affairs of the nation, regardless of his attainments.

But it is this writer's belief that, because of the challenging phenomena of social tensions in America, the need for a changed viewpoint on the important question of race relations can neither be minimized nor overemphasized. It seems to him that "coordination of interests," through the establishment of which the ultimate freedom of all Americans will be attained, may be secured only in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, —an atmosphere wherein calm judgment and rational behavior would be the dominant factors in any attempt at the solution of those problems confronting the two races. It is in such an atmosphere, he is convinced, that the problem of the Negro's continued presence in America, and of his ultimate destiny as an integral part of the American nation, can and will find satisfactory solution. The need for the removal of the basic causes of their conflict transcends the common concept of the relative parts they were intended to play in the great drama of life.

To find a means whereby this end may be accomplished is a matter of paramount importance. The bridging of that gap would mark the destruction of the most formidable barrier to the attainment of the American ideal of the individual liberty and collective freedom of its citizens. The ideals of government cannot be attained, however, without that high degree of social consciousness which makes for the moral enrichment of a nation. Obviously, if the ultimate aim of the American nation is the development of a social consciousness that would recognize the necessity for "freedom with justice" for all its citizens, the process employed for achieving it should not be, as is so often the case, "unreasoning social impulse," but, rather, the deliberate use of the social will for the promotion

of that unity among its diverse ethnic groups that would guarantee the stability of the nation's institutions.

The increasing pressure of national necessities has compelled the recognition of the enduring quality of the purposive association of Negroes and whites. That there is room for improving the social relations between the two peoples in this indissoluble union none can doubt. But the promotion of the general welfare depends upon the solution of an old problem. That problem is: Recognizing the need for that coordination in their associated activities which would insure equal and exact justice to every American, how can the two races make the necessary compromises in their daily contacts that would not demand the sacrifice of individual freedom?

In a partnership between individuals, which aims at an equitable distribution of the gains made, or of the mutual benefits accruing therefrom, the basis for determining the participating rights of each party is the nature and value of his individual contribution. It is in this manner, also, that the rights of the members of a social organization are established. When, in addition, obedience to a common sovereign power, and the fact of its supremacy is acknowledged and accepted by all the individuals of the society so affected, the very nature of those obligations renders such rights inviolable.

But the theory of the inviolableness of rights thus secured fails of consistent exemplification in our democracy. The studied denial of the exercise of his most elementary rights by the Negro, and the attempt to reduce him to the sorry condition of a social outcast, even after he had accepted the responsibilities and assumed the obligations of his membership within the body politic, are negations of the promise of American democracy. The circumscription of his freedom, in spite of the fact of his contribution to the establishment of the common sovereign power of the nation, is a phenomenon unparalleled in history. And this condition exists as a result of the deliberate distortion of the facts that portray his historical background, and the misinterpretation of his purpose and functions in the American social order.

It should not be forgotten that, by the weight of his numbers, and his unquestioned courage and fortitude on the field of battle during America's civil war, the Negro contributed also to the restoration of "all the vital rights of minorities and of individuals...so plainly assured to them by affirmations and negations, guarantees and prohibitions, in the Constitution."

Thus was the principle established that "a majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people."

If the temple of liberty, which is America, has realized the ideal of providing the means of perpetuating "the eternal principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity embodied in the Declaration, the quintessence of which is pursuit of happiness," it is because the Negro made his contribution in such great measure to the emergence of American civilization.

In the words of a distinguished Southern Baptist minister:

> We are the Negro's debtor for services rendered; we have been and are and shall continue to be, the beneficiaries of his toil. For generations the Negro was our slave. He felled our forests, tilled our soil, gathered our harvests, tended our homes. It is largely through his sweat and toil that our country, North and South, has become what it is. . . . No thoughtful American can ignore the debt and the obligation that we owe the race, unless he has a heart of stone. . . . Our millions have come to us largely through the Negro's toil. Our civilization is largely his achievement, view it as you will. As he has been and is the producer of our civilization, he of right ought to receive, and we both of privilege and of debt ought to bestow, a full measure upon him, until he shall realize the highest and best things possible to him as our brother.

Truly, when viewed by the Negro, and gauged by his experiences in a society that offers security, justice, and equality of opportunity to all others but him, freedom is, indeed, a tragedy. To right this wrong, the American ideal of freedom with justice must be secured for him. To accomplish this end a re-examination of the historical realities with which he is identified, and of their significance in determining his place and fated state in the scheme of things, becomes a necessary factor in the process of racial adjustment. Thus, and thus only, will be born tolerance of the Negro's hopes, and sympathy with his aspirations. Thus, and thus only, can justice be done, liberty remain unfettered, and freedom maintained.

Worship and Social Progress

HERBERT STURGES

Social disintegration is accompanied by a decreasing efficiency in the images and language of worship. New patterns of worship and new objects of worship are gradually introduced. Among these are some which are adequate stimuli for the social thought and action needed for new social integration.

Says an old French proverb: *Autres temps, autres moeurs.* Social change involves a remaking of the mores. The old folkways lose their effectiveness. The old rituals no longer satisfy.

The Achilles' heel of institutions, developed in ancient Greece, Rome, and Palestine, is their failure to function successfully under new conditions. The mind trained in science sees no truth in the folk tales of antiquity. The old myth of creation gives way to the hypothesis of evolution. The comforting old belief in the salvation of a few is remade into the new gospel of the development of all persons, security and satisfaction for all people.

The images of worship change. The older images were the gods-saving-a-few: the miracle workers of the old legends healing a few sick people, bringing a few dead back to life, freeing a few sinners from the guilt of their sins, and in the end transforming the few saved into eternal, holy, triumphant deities.

"Sin," a supposedly conscious choice of evil, freely willed transgression of the known laws of God, is deservedly punished by troubles in this world and eternal torment in the world to come.

But our newer understanding leaves no place for

such ideas. Misfortunes come to people, it is true; they suffer, they are discouraged, weary and heavy laden. But these are the consequences of social maladjustment, the invisible bacteria of disease, economic insufficiency and insecurity. Poverty and war are not the will of the gods; they are manifestations of a selective process in human society, very similar to the struggle for existence throughout the domain of life.

The persons who were formerly supposed to have violated divine decrees are now thought of as those who fail in the life struggle against disease, or succumb in the blind operations of economic evolution. Thus the scientific interpretation of human misfortunes as an aspect of biological and societal evolution replaces the theological explanation of sin and the justifiable wrath of God.

What, then, becomes of the images of worship? Must we continue to bow to an all-wise and all-powerful deity? Shall we go on paying tributes of our will and of our substance to please him? Shall we endeavor through songs of praise to flatter him into kindness towards us? How confident can modern educated people be in the successful results of religious ceremonies?

No. There is a gradual blurring of focus in the image of deity. Slowly in these decades of growing enlightenment about the facts of the social process, social images of worship begin to appear, vague at first, but more and more distinct as our social knowledge grows.

As one kind of image fades out, the new images of worship come into being; the picture of the gods saving me, saving us few, is gradually replaced by the picture of happiness for all humanity. This is the new image of worship. Security, welfare, a high standard of living for all.

See the social and economic hazards which accompany the picture worship of the gods-saving-a-few. The righteous prosper in business; the sinners fail; they go on through poverty to drunkenness, disease and crime, punished to the glory of God. The righteous nation is victorious in war; the wicked enemy is vanquished and subjugated. But these pictures are false. The rich succeed by chance, by initiative, which happens to extend in the direction of economic development; by hitting upon new fortunate devices of machinery, commerce, finance; by organizing the labor of others in mining, manufacturing, marketing; by fortunate investments, often gaining the unearned financial reward produced by the growth of population and the opening up of new territories, rich in mineral and agricultural wealth. The poor are those who through chance fail to achieve these new wonders. They are the laborers in the vineyard. They are the handicapped, the less vigorous, lacking vitamins, poorly nourished, suffering from neglect in childhood, overworked, unemployed, growing up in city slums, educated in gangs of youthful thieves, thrown into conflict with parents, with the law. These are the "unfit" to survive and prosper in a selective, competitive society which is careless of the conditions under which children come into the world, unmindful of the brutalities and terrors which beat upon children and the forces of vice and crime which are allowed to play upon the minds of children, forming habits of theft, vagrancy, depravity; laying the seeds of disease in their bodies, undermining the character, destroying the souls of children.

But this is "social sin," social neglect; and the effective pictures for our worship are the images of proper care for children, better homes, better schools, elimination of city slums, replacement of city gangs by centers of recreation, societal reconstruction of the environment of childhood and youth.

Our new worship pictures include: population control through education for planned parenthood, education attractive to children and young people, universal good health, economic abundance, continuous full employment, industrial stability through the merging of the interests of labor and management, and international peace under world federal government.

As the older pictures of worship fade, replaced by new, so also do the older forms of the language of worship gradually drop out of our vocabulary. Newly discovered truths about our social life and social processes are expressed increasingly in a new language of worship.

The steady growth of social knowledge slowly but surely changes our sense of what is true. The ancestors pictured and described human life in terms of imperfect conformity to imperfectly perceived patterns of divine guidance. Hence their language and images of worship were theological. This kind of religion has conspicuously failed to make the world a better and safer place to live in. What is needed is social study, directed especially to the analysis of social problems; and social action based on the results of social study. There is no other effective approach to social readjustment. The new knowledge of social life available in the new sciences of psychology, sociology, health, and political economy must be followed in new ways of social and religious service.

The present evil conditions of the life of the individual and of society must be changed into good conditions favorable to the total health of the people, to our total security, welfare, and happiness. These are the new images of worship which are the sufficient stimuli of social action using the effective means of social science. The new sociological language of religious worship can express adequately the social needs for prevention of harm and suffering to mankind; and new truth will direct our religious action into the proper lines of social reconstruction and progress.

Mahatma Gandhi

The little brown man in the garden,
Peace, was his potent word;
Unity for Moslem and Hindu,
Banish forever the sword.

He prayed and fasted like Jesus
Had fasted and prayed long ago;
Each had his garden of Gethsemane
Each knew betrayal and woe.

"Forgive them." Words ne'er forgotten.
Through martyrdom, he'll live again;
Thoughts he has sown will be multiplied
Deep in the souls of men.

The little brown man in the garden,
Peace, was his potent word;
Unity for Moslem and Hindu,
Banish forever the sword.

DOLLIE VANDALL BINGMAN.

The Way to Peace

LEO HIRSCH

"The structure of world peace cannot be the work of one man or one party or one nation." Thus spoke the late President Roosevelt in a message to Congress on March 1, 1945. He went on to point out that the peace must be one which rests on the cooperative effort of the whole world, and that in order to make it a lasting peace it must be one in which the larger nations work absolutely in unison in order to prevent war.

He then mentioned the close relationship between the British Empire and the United States, and the great friendship between the Russian people and the American people, reminding his listeners that these were manifestations of a new spirit in the world. "Let us hang on to both friendships," he pleaded, "and by spreading that spirit around the world we may have a peaceful period for our grandchildren to grow up in."

We could ask for no brighter beacon, no steadier guide on the road to peace than all the work and striving of this great American epitomized. Yet, less than four years after his death, the will to peace is rapidly disintegrating.

How is it possible that less than four years after the cessation of hostilities in the greatest conflict the world has ever known, and even before treaties have been framed to formalize that cessation of hostilities, we have allowed ourselves to stray so far from the way to peace? Only a very great tragedy is allowing it to happen. The vast gulf of misunderstanding that yawns between the United States and the Soviet Union *is* a tragedy—for us, for the Russians, and for the entire world.

Many think that this misunderstanding is due to the political and economic differences between the two nations. We venture to disagree with this somewhat naive and easy explanation, and to advance the belief that rather it is due to a systematic and deliberate propaganda of misinformation which is being carried on by powerful groups within both nations. Thanks to this misinformation, the people of America and the people of Russia, who have much in common, are effectively prevented from knowing one another.

In the United States, the decisive political power is wielded by our great industrial and financial leaders.

In the Soviet Union, the decisive political power is in the hands of a comparatively small group of leaders of the Communist Party.

If this double campaign of propaganda, on the part of both the United States and the Soviet Union, were to end in itself, the situation would not be so alarming and dangerous. Unfortunately, the propaganda, on both sides, is designed merely as preparation for the fatal and foolish step of war.

As Americans, we can see this process more clearly in our own country than we can possibly observe it in the Soviet Union. For example, we hear the daily harping of our militarists on the need for strong defensive preparations. Despite the fact that at the present time, we are spending a sum on national defense, so-called, that is equivalent to seventy dollars annually for every man, women, and child in the United States, our militarists cry out for more, and more, and more. There is at present a powerful movement afoot to bring peacetime compulsory military training to this country, and there are even some fanatics who preach the necessity for bringing such training down to high school and grade school level. We have, moreover, embarked upon a dangerous tendency to entrust civilian matters to the judgment and decisions of the military. The domestic pattern of our industrial-military alliance is concealed behind the smokescreen of red-baiting, anti-Communism, and Russophobia.

Our clues as to what is going on in the Soviet Union are few. But we do have the pronouncements of their high officials, carefully formulated for world-wide consumption. We hear Vishinsky and Gromyko accuse the United States of breaking faith with its former ally, the Soviet Union, and we hear them denounce, as warmongers, many Americans who hold prominent and influential positions in economic, diplomatic, and political affairs.

The wedge thus being driven between the American and the Russian people is all the more tragic because the two nations have a tremendous area of common ground upon which to meet and to cooperate. Their political and economic differences are not as great as the haters on both sides would have us believe. Actually, they are two great powers moving in the same direction. Both nations are products of the great revolutionary movements of the last two centuries. Both nations cherish the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

Here in the United States, we are in many respects still striving toward the social and racial equality that the Soviet Union has to an amazing degree already achieved. We might ask ourselves if her success in this accomplishment has not at least to some degree been achieved by her firm insistence that economics and politics are, in the final analysis, synonomous. On the other hand, we enjoy a degree of political freedom that is today unknown in the Soviet Union. But do we not owe at least a measure of that political freedom to a long and almost uninterrupted period of economic development and security such as the Soviet Union, to date, has never been blessed with? The truth of the matter is that the differences are not in kind, but in degree. Even the economic system, under Communist principles, is far more flexible and less dogmatic than most Americans suppose. Private property is not prohibited, nor is enterprise discouraged, as we commonly assume. Rewards are not denied to ability and initiative. But the dangerous power of exploitation of man by man, which is inherent in monopoly capital in private hands, is most definitely prohibited in the Soviet Union, which is adamant in its insistence that the means of production lie in the hands of all of the people as represented by the state.

Finally, one of the most important areas of common agreement between the two nations is revealed in their respective historical backgrounds. Neither nation is basically militaristic, and both the Russian and the

American people are peace-loving rather than warlike.

Since there is so much of common ground between the two nations, are there not opportunities for both, separately and jointly, to work out programs and take steps that would resolve the conflict between them before the shooting war starts? We believe that there are. Although some American citizens have apparently forgotten it, many millions of them still remember the encouraging and heartwarming advice given to this nation by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, on the occasion of his first inauguration as President in 1933. "The only thing we have to fear," he declared, "is fear itself." The words are as true today as they were then, and they are in order, not only for the United States, but for the whole world, including the Soviet Union. In both the domestic field, and in that of foreign affairs, there are steps to be taken, both by the United States and the Soviet Union, which would irresistibly banish the fear that alone is driving them toward fatal and tragic mutual enmity.

Let us turn first to the possibilities that confront the United States of retrieving the present sorry situation, of remolding it nearer to the heart's desire of all its people for peace and security. And let us first examine the choices in the domestic field.

If asked to choose our greatest instrument for peace, security, and well-being, few thoughtful Americans would deny that it is the democracy in which we so ardently believe. By the same token, few would deny that, lulled by the long period of splendid isolation from any real responsibility for the well-being of the world that we enjoyed for more than a hundred years after the establishment of our nation, we have allowed our precious instrument of democracy to accumulate some very bad and unsightly rust spots. The worst of these rust spots, perhaps, is that from an economic point of view our system of democracy is marked by inequalities, injustice, suffering, and chaos. We have clung to the "rugged individualism," the absolute free enterprise, and the monopoly capital of the nineteenth century without realizing or admitting that in a world dominated by technology and scientific and mechanical invention and discovery, these things are no longer possible, either in Europe or in the United States. Indeed, now that we have unleashed the incredibly tremendous power of the smashed atom, they are not possible anywhere.

Can we rub away this rust spot of economic inequality that so disfigures our beautiful tool of democracy? If we have the courage to inaugurate certain basic reforms, we can indeed. Among these basic reforms may be listed the socialization of natural resources, the encouragement and fostering of farmers' and consumers' cooperatives, the liberation of our tenant farmers through land reforms, the raising of our living standards by minimum wage scales which will permit every family in the United States to be well-fed, well-housed, and well-clothed, the abolition of our city and rural slums through a program of Federal, state, and municipal housing, and the raising of our health standards through a sound national program of health insurance.

It will require courage and unity on the part of the common people of the United States to initiate such fundamental economic reforms, and to carry them through, because measures such as these we propose are, and will continue to be, attacked by the monopoly capitalists and the militarists as Communism. What their enemies will try to conceal from the common people is the fact that every single one of these measures is possible of achievement within the framework of the political democracy of the United States. Not a one of them is prohibited by our Constitution, whose framers wisely refused to limit the power of the people in whom all sovereignty resides.

Assuming that such fundamental measures of economic reform were put through by the people of the United States, by the peaceful exercise of their own sovereign political power, would our resulting economy be a socialistic one? To a degree, yes. It would, in fact, be a mixed economy, partly socialistic, partly cooperative, and partly capitalistic. Free enterprise would not be destroyed, but its power of exploitation of man by man would be severely curtailed, if not abolished completely.

Would it be an "un-American" economy? Nobody even cursorily familiar with our history could so maintain. Already, under the leadership of the late President Roosevelt, we have made a small, but brilliantly encouraging step in this direction. We refer, of course, to the Tennessee Valley Authority, which stands today as a model for all the world of how basic economic reforms may be achieved according to a peculiarly American pattern. It is no accident that many of the most competent and objective observers, of all nationalities, who have devoted attention to the situation in Palestine have talked in terms of a Jordan Valley Authority. There can be no doubt that if the vast sums which today we are spending on so-called "national defense" were being devoted to the development of an Ohio Valley Authority, a Mississippi Valley Authority, a Missouri Valley Authority, and a Columbia Valley Authority, the economic security and well-being of our people would be immeasurably increased, and their fears of the future would be correspondingly allayed.

There is another rust spot on our shining instrument of democracy in that the political freedom of which we always boast so proudly is not freely extended to all of the citizens within our borders. We have about fourteen million Negro citizens who are subject to discriminations ranging all the way from denial of the right to vote in several southern states to denial of fair economic, social, and educational opportunities there and in other parts of our country. We have innumerable minority groups, such as Jews, Poles, Slavs, Italians, Mexicans, Japanese, and many others who in one way or another are denied full enjoyment of the political, economic, and social freedoms that under a vital democracy must be the right of all.

These abuses must be corrected, partly by a program of political reform, which must include a Federal Anti-Lynching Law, as well as a Federal Anti-Poll Tax Law, and partly by a program of educational reform. We must have legislation, enforced by a vigorous program of education, to end discrimination, separatism, and Jim-Crowism within our borders.

Our educational system must be reformed so that its benefits are brought within the reach of all, and its program must be revised so that it is brought in line with the realities of our modern world of technological, scientific, and mechanical development. Our teaching of many subjects, such as American history and government, must be revitalized, so that our people acquire new faith in the spendidly dynamic power of our own democratic system. Education must help our

people to overcome the fear of change in a changing world, so that they may have increased awareness of the rich benefits, economically, politically, socially, and culturally, that are within their grasp in the framework of the United States Constitution.

So much for the basic reforms needed in the United States in the domestic field. Others might be mentioned, but the scope of our discussion permits us only to indicate, through brief mention of fundamentals, the direction in which we should steer. Our people need only the courage and unity to turn in this direction, and to follow it unfalteringly to bring about such a revitalization of American democracy as will stagger the whole world, and put to rest forever all fears of Communist penetration.

Turning to the Soviet Union, we find that despite our firm but friendly conviction that domestic reforms are needed there quite as much as they are here, we cannot outline anything like as specific a program for them. The reason for this is obvious. We have very little actual evidence of what is going on within the Soviet Union. We have the shrill and hysterical cries of her enemies, and the resounding voices of her friends, and for us these combine in a chorus of confusion. We do not wish to overlook faults and weaknesses, but neither do we wish to repeat slanders and falsehoods.

We can, however, make a few general suggestions. From our vantage point on this side of the Atlantic Ocean, it seems to us that the most glaring inherent weakness in the Soviet Union's system of government is the lack of political freedom accorded to her citizens. We note that there is only one political party in the Soviet Union, and that when elections are held only one slate of candidates is presented to the people. We observe that nowhere in the vast territory of the Russias are books, magazines, and newspapers carrying articles criticizing the central government available to the people. We hear that when the central government of the Soviet Union decides that heavy industry must be developed behind the Ural Mountains, workers from other parts of Russia are transported to the locality, and that they have no choice in the matter, that regardless of their personal plans and inclinations they must obey the call of the government. We learn that only rarely is an average citizen permitted to leave Russian territory, and that so strictly is this prohibition against foreign travel enforced that British soldiers who married Russian girls during the war are now separated from their wives, who are not permitted to join their husbands in England. If a political trial occurs in Moscow, as happened some ten or eleven years ago, before the outbreak of the war, we are profoundly shocked and disturbed to note that the prisoners are not regarded as innocent until they are proved guilty, that there is no defense made by representing attorneys, that there is no judgment rendered by a jury of peers, that, in fact, the trials themselves consist largely of oral confessions of guilt by the accused parties, and that the viewpoint of the average Russian citizen is, incredibly, that the trials are in themselves indisputable proof of guilt, because if there were no guilt, there would be no trial!

To us, all of these things add up to a shocking lack of political freedom, and we are profoundly worried in contemplating them. The Russians, of course, have their explanations for these political phenomena that so shock and disturb us. Without going into a detailed discussion of what these explanations are, we may advance the proposition that the lack of political freedom in the Soviet Union is in reality a hangover of the revolutionary psychology, and that it is a pretty exact measure of the sense of fear and insecurity that haunts the Russians concerning the permanence and consolidation of their revolutionary gains.

In all fairness, we must admit that they have had considerable grounds for such fear. In order to achieve their revolution at all, they had to fight not only the forces of Czarism, but the armies of practically all of the capitalist nations in the Western world, including the army of the United States. In order to insure its gains, they had to start from scratch, at a point at least two hundred years behind the leading capitalist countries, on a program of intensive economic development. This was a tremendous task, and they had just barely reached the possibility of a brief breathing spell when the second World War came, and they were engulfed in it, at a cost in destruction of lives and property exceeding by many times that of any other nation involved in the conflict. And all of this has taken place in a brief period of three decades.

Under the circumstances, the Russians have regarded political freedom as we define it as an unnecessary luxury at this time, thereby failing to understand how essential political freedom is for the maintaining and guarding of their own economic security. They have, moreover, contended that their present system of political dictatorship is but the temporary bridge to the democratic ideal for the realization of which they are striving.

If there is any lesson for Russia in the recent world-wide conflict, it is that the flames of that holocaust forged and tempered the strength of their system of Communism, and welded their people to it in bonds of unbreakable devotion. As far as the Russian people are concerned, the possibility of failure to achieve permanence and consolidation of the gains made in their revolution is now more remote than at any time since 1917.

The great difficulty is that the Russians themselves do not realize this. They are still paralyzed in the grip of their deadly fear of encirclement and treason. In order to exorcise this fear, therefore, we would suggest that the first and most essential step for the Soviet Union to take on the domestic front would be immediate invokement and enforcement of the constitution of 1936. This would not, perhaps, achieve all in the way of domestic reform that the most rabid critics of the Soviet system would like to see accomplished, but it would guarantee to the Russian people a really large measure of political freedom and democracy. It would make available to the Russian people new sources of moral and spiritual strength through which they could really attain that stability and permanence for their system which, it is obvious, they fear will elude them. Such a step would tremendously increase the moral stature of the Russian government, and would guarantee it a genuine welcome at the council tables of the world.

We have another step to suggest. The initiative and vigor with which the Soviet government has attacked the problem of education has aroused the admiration of all thoughtful people in the world. Illiteracy has been all but abolished in a vast territory, far more heavily populated than that of the United States, and

even the most violent Russophobe must admit that in the brief space of thirty years, this is no mean accomplishment. Ignorance and illiteracy were the Maginot Line of Czarism, while education has served as the dynamo of Communism. But it is not enough that people be educated. They must be educated along broad and progressive lines. In a world made one by the terrible potentialities of atomic fissure, all people must have available full and free information concerning conditions in that world.

Here, it seems to us, the Soviet system has failed badly. Because of their deadly fear of treason and encirclement, the Soviet leaders have misguidedly sought to withhold from the Russian people practically all information concerning not only the United States, but all capitalist countries in the world. Because the United States and other capitalist countries are sharing with them the attempt to create the United Nations, the Soviet rulers are denying to the Russian people practically all essential knowledge concerning that organization which, after all, represents the world's best hope for the achievement of a permanent and stable peace.

It seems to us that this is a tragic mistake that can only end in leaving the Soviet Union vulnerable to all of the dangers and errors of isolationism. We would therefore suggest that the Soviet government lose no time in liberalizing the educational program of the people, so that information and ideas of all sorts can be freely exchanged on a world-wide basis.

Were the Soviet government to take the two steps that we have recommended, the Russian people would be truly amazed at the capacity for winning friends and influencing people that they would thereby acquire. And Americans and Russians alike would be astounded at the ease with which the two nations could reach mutual and equitable agreement on many of their problems.

Turning from the domestic field to that of foreign affairs, we find that there are a number of steps for the two nations to take which would further increase the guaranties of world-wide peace and security. Some of these steps are overlapping, and some of them must be taken by each country independently of the other.

Of the overlapping steps, the first and by far the greatest is that both the Soviet Union and the United States must give immediate and wholehearted support to the development and strengthening of the United Nations. It must be their mutual aim to develop that organization into an effective instrument of world government, and a sound guaranty of world peace. Naturally, this implies a willingness on the part of both nations to modify their ideas of national sovereignty. To the patriotic fire-eaters of both nations, this seems an impossibility, but it has been accomplished before in the history of the world. The United States itself would not be in existence today had not thirteen small, independent state governments, who thought of themselves as sovereign, after some thirteen years of anguished uncertainty and hesitation, finally yielded that jealously guarded sovereignty for the common good. In view of this historical fact, we make the suggestion that the United States take the leadership and initiative in inaugurating this great work of developing and strengthening the United Nations. She has had more experience in this field than any other nation in the world, and she has enjoyed more of the benefits to be derived from a yielding of sovereignty for the common good. She might make a start in this direction by openly abandoning the rash and foolhardy Truman Doctrine, and by submitting the Marshall Plan to the United Nations for correction of its obvious faults and weaknesses, and finally by entrusting its accomplishment to United Nations auspices.

Both nations must relinquish all imperialistic and expansionist aims. Russia must cease her attempts to acquire strategic positions aimed against the United States. The United States must stop her hysterical drive for army and navy bases all over the world.

Both nations must deny themselves the luxury of unilateral action. It will be recalled that in the United States, the Truman Doctrine was widely justified on the grounds that since the United Nations is too weak to maintain proper guaranties of world peace, we, the world's strongest nation, must therefore, on our own initiative, act in its place. This is foolish and dangerous nonsense. The weakness of the United Nations can only be corrected by strengthening it, and the only way to strengthen it is for the powerful nations of the world, like the United States and the Soviet Union, to make use of it wholeheartedly and in good faith. The Greek situation, like the China situation and the Near East situation, in all of which both the United States and Russia are involved, is the business of the United Nations, and not of any individual nation, no matter how powerful.

These steps of supporting the United Nations organization, and of relinquishing for good and all the selfish, foolhardy, and dangerous luxury of unilateral action might well be implemented through a hundred year peace pact between the United States and the Soviet Union. The basis of this pact should be a mutual agreement to spend the money, effort, and strength which the two nations are now devoting and planning to devote to warlike adventures against each other, in the cause of building and strengthening the United Nations. And an essential part of the pact, would, of course, be a mutual moratorium on all warmongering and hate.

These, briefly, are steps which, if the American and Russian people have the courage, initiative, and unity to take, will lead the world away from the threat of war, and into the safe and beautiful harbor of peace and security for all men. It will mean patience, tolerance, understanding, and sacrifice on the part of both nations, but never has the challenge been so inspiring, or the goal so rewarding for all humanity. Surely the two strongest and greatest nations on earth cannot fail to meet that challenge side by side and to reach that goal together!

Gandhi Had Love

Gandhi, with the depth of smiles in his brown eyes, will loom before mankind as a towering, unsurpassed mountain peak. The rest of us do well to sit in silent wonder on our little hills and watch the rising sun of truth cast reddening gleams upon the summit of his life. Perhaps we might almost hear his friendly voice—"I had no sword, no gun, no bodyguard. I didn't need them. I had love."

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

Toward the Understanding of Protestantism

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

To the superficial observer, Protestantism today must present a scene of strange confusion and bedlam, of uncontrolled individualism, and of almost complete spiritual anarchy. He sees a congeries of churches, denominations, and sects held together by the most tenuous threads of tradition and doctrine, some of these churches, denominations, and sects numbering their adherents by the millions, others by only a few thousand, and all of them setting up a mighty clamor as to their authority to interpret the Bible, to claim to be "the true church," and to supply mankind with the means of grace and the agencies necessary to "salvation." There are in the world today probably more than three hundred Protestant churches and sects, ranging from the mighty Evangelical Lutheran Church, in point of communicant members the greatest of them all, to fly-by-night sects and groups that pitch their tents on some city square tonight, to be gone and forgotten tomorrow.

On the surface, Protestantism today seems the logical heir of Protestantism yesterday with its violent theological disputes, its incessant quarrels, conflicts, and schisms, and its never-ending warfare over delicate points of doctrine and practice. The beginnings of Protestantism in the sixteenth century seem to have come to a natural and consistent fruition in the Protestantism of more than four hundred years, in the course of which Protestant lands have been defiled with the blood of fratricidal wars, churches have refused to admit to their altars those of other confessions, and even assemblies of Protestants bearing the same denominational name have refused to repeat together the words of the Lord's Prayer. All this may not seem so very strange when we recall how centuries ago Martin Luther and Zwingli disagreed violently over such words as "this is" and "this signifies" and such doughty warriors of the spirit as Calvin and Knox had little sympathy for their theological opponents whom they anathematized with passion and gusto. And let us not forget how many of the wars that have been fought since the beginnings of Protestantism had their roots in the fury and folly of theologians, both Protestants and Catholics, as well as in the ambitions of Kings and rulers of Catholic and non-Catholic countries. It is a sad fact that the Protestant churches of today have preserved so much of the stubbornness and rank individualism of the past that the ancient traditions of Puritanical moralizing and theological disputatiousness still remain the order of the day and the plague of church life. Even today, Protestants, despite all the movements for unity and ecumenicity, show those strangely outmoded tendencies to be theologically aloof and denominationally isolationist. True, there have been some important mergers in our own day; but much of the glory of such unity is dimmed if not lost when we remember how long it took these groups to discover grounds for union and how trivial were the issues that originally divided them. Then again, we have in recent attempts at union such unpleasant and startling evidence of the prevalence of the old spirit of schism and parochialism that we wonder how churchmen can possibly display such obstinacy and obscurantism and still expect men and women to respect and follow them.

But on the other hand, we should not judge too quickly or harshly on the evidence of the surface appearances in present-day Protestantism; and it must also be remembered that sectarian proliferation and denominational differentiation may be not only signs of confusion and disorder but also evidence of healthy growth and of natural development. Viewed from this angle, the years of Protestant history will fall into a pattern where much that appears as anarchy and disintegration takes on the outlines of lusty "birthing" and of fascinating adventure, of struggle for larger truths, and warfare in the name of the spirit. Looking under the surface of things, such phenomena as the following may well appear as not all loss but even a gain for the stream of religious development. Let us frankly face them:

1. It is true that Protestantism arose in protest against certain practices and doctrines of a great historic church, and while it is also true that many of the abuses against which the early reformers thundered were later copied and remodeled by the Protestants, it must also be remembered that Protestantism has always remained a fertile soil for the seed of revolt against ecclesiastical absolutism, against an arrogant dogmatism, against a stereotyped and mechanized formula of worship, against bibliolatry, Mariolatry, and other perversions. While Protestants have many original sins of their own to atone for, while their own ecclesiastical escutcheon is far from pure and unstained, it is also true that in Protestant countries you have had during all these centuries since the Reformation, much more than in non-Protestant lands, an atmosphere of freedom, an environment favorable to individual liberty, to democratic processes, and to the cultivation of the agencies for social progress.

2. Let us recall that while owing much to the labors of the French Roman Catholic physician, Jean Astruc, in 1751, the new and scientific approach to the Bible—the historical method or higher criticism—was developed and defended primarily by Protestant scholars and schools. It was in Protestant countries that this great book of our religion was first rescued from the fetters of a deadening literalism and from the shackles of a fundamentalism that threatened the vital message of this mighty book; granted that to this day many Protestant churches deny this knowledge and refuse its enlightenment. And it was in Protestant lands that such doctrines as those of the church, of the priesthood, of the sacraments, etc., received new formulation and definition which made of these ancient concepts of religion matters for individual evaluation and appraisal, and therefore tools for the broader development of the human personality and for the deepening of personal spiritual religion. Surely, even in Protestantism we still find remnants of ancient superstitions and idols, but it may be said without fear of effective contradiction that liberty has become the legitimate consort of Protestantism and that their union has been a boon to mankind.

3. It would, of course, be grossly unfair to say that Protestants have any sort of monopoly upon wisdom and scholarly pursuit whether in the arts or in the sciences; on the other hand, it is only fair to say that science operates with greater freedom and under less

restriction from church and government in Protestant lands than elsewhere. True, Protestants have also persecuted their thinkers and mistreated their men of genius, and before we denounce the Inquisition too loudly let us remember that John Calvin had Servetus burned at the stake in Geneva and that modern America had her Scopes trial. However, it is a matter of common knowledge that such scientific theories as those of evolution and the newer astronomy, such advanced social theses as those of planned parenthood and euthanasia, etc., have found infinitely more understanding and sympathetic reception in Protestant communities than in non-Protestant localities.

4. The same is true of many features of social reform and economic improvement. I am not forgetting the great social encyclicals of recent Popes nor the fact that many a brave and courageous advocate of economic reform and social change has come from the ranks of Catholicism. But, again, it is only rehearsing historical facts to say that Socialism and the Cooperative Movement have found more favor in Protestant than in non-Protestant lands, and that the Protestant atmosphere has in most instances proved infinitely more congenial to social reform and to interracial and intercultural improvements than has the environment of non-Protestant lands. And what about anti-Semitism? Unquestionably, Protestantism must share with Catholicism the burden of guilt for the most vicious of all forms of anti-Semitism, i.e., religious anti-Semitism. But while we have had from the Vatican itself only so mild a statement as "spiritually we are Semites," it must be said to the credit of Protestant leaders within the churches and without that it is they, not their non-Protestant neighbors, who have most valiantly led the fight against this pernicious evil, and even today are in the front ranks of those who battle for justice to the Jew and for the open door to Palestine.

5. Similarly, political freedom has always been more at home in a Protestant locale. True, it was in the very home of the Reformation, in Luther's Germany, that our generation's worst dictator, Adolph Hitler, arose; however, Hitler was himself not a Protestant, and among his earliest and most determined opponents were clergymen of the Evangelical Confessional Church of Germany. And is it not further true that all the other dictators of our age, Mussolini, Franco, their many puny imitators in Latin America, and even Stalin himself, are all products of non-Protestant countries and cultures? It may be not entirely malapropos to add that political totalitarianism is much more likely to find fertile soil in lands accustomed to the dictatorship of an absolutistic church and a priesthood claiming an "apostolic succession" than in Protestant lands where such ideas are frowned upon.

No, there is no reason to assume that Protestantism is either dead or beyond redemption; on the contrary, Protestantism seems to me to be very much alive and facing the greatest challenge of its colorful history. An atomic age needs a newly oriented church. An age seeking to realize the ideals of One World and One Humanity demands a church devoted to the Unity of God and to the Brotherhood of Man. Is there one good reason why Protestantism, alive and aware of its new opportunities, should not be able to supply this new orientation and to furnish the spiritual dynamic needed to make of the atomic age an age of plenty, of security, of peace, and justice instead of an epoch of sustained fear and ever-present insecurity?

I see no reason why Protestantism should not be able to lead mankind religiously, morally, and spiritually, and in fellowship with every other living faith of today, towards the world of our dreams and the society of our noblest aspirations. Protestantism has the spirit, it has the tradition, and it can, if it will, fashion the instruments necessary to implement its call to leadership. A liberal Protestantism together with a liberal Judaism could perform miracles in a world where faith in miracles seems at a pretty low ebb. But this will take courage, it will take faith, and it will take a mighty dedication to tremendous tasks and a will to do battle for the Lord of Hosts.

Protestantism's great opportunity is here; we cannot meet it with small minds and puny ideas, nor with thought-patterns that follow denominational and sectarian lines, nor with doctrines that have about them the musty smell of traditionalism and antiquated theologies. Valiantly and heroically we must face tomorrow with a purpose and a plan that take direction from eternal justice and substance from eternal truth.

Political Ring-Around

GEORGE McLURE

It seems not long ago since the ground of parliamentary politics was assumed rather than argued. The parties, also, and the dialectics of their discussion, were assumed. "Conservative" described simply those groups which upheld established conditions; the experimental groups were named "Progressive"; those which paused to weigh and consider were "Liberal." More simply still, the terms "right" and "left" had become habitual; for in the parliaments of France and Italy the delegates were ranged to right and left of the Speaker according to their doctrinal affiliations, and "rightest" and "leftist" were universally taken as meaning "conservative" and "radical."

Today, the system and the very function of parliament are being seriously challenged. Particular organized parties are seen to change their nature and intention. Political opposites interpenetrate in a most confusing manner. Yet, by a natural lag in popular thinking, these old terms, now inadequate, are still current. By a simplification that is false, the parties are still supposed to be ranged in some sort of indefinitely extensible arc. This sort of misunderstanding adds to the gen-

eral confusion; and any effort towards clarification is pertinent, if only because everyone contributes, as a voter, to the final issue. At the least, if a simple image of the political field serves any useful purpose, it is surely high time that a new one be presented.

As the American parties mask the complexity of modern politics, it is necessary to trace the more explicit situation in Europe. Modern democracy was born around the North Atlantic—in Holland, England, France, North America, Scandinavia. And of particular importance are the English, who so conceived the function of debate in politics as to institute the Official Opposition. England is the Mother of Parliaments. It was the English who taught that because a governing party always goes stale in office a critical alternative is required to replace it at the will of the electorate. And it was they who gave classic expression to the great divisions of social interest in their Conservative and Liberal parties.

Modern parliamentary democracy succeeded the medieval government of autocrats and oligarchies because it gave superior expression to essential needs and principles. Both the conservatism and liberalism of democracy gave such expression. They both embodied relatively valid conceptions of human nature and of the external conditions of life. Conservatism had the stronger sense of reality and necessity. Liberalism had the stronger sense of ideality and possibility.

In a worldly sense, conservatism is a defense mechanism for the materially prosperous. To become a formidable social force, it recruits the multitude of ordinary folk depressed by psychological inertia. Anyone ridden by anxiety or obsessed by the need for security is the natural-born conservative. Here curiosity is abjured and imagination stultified. Yet conservatism is a profound philosophy also. Conservatism preserves the concept of an impersonal law, the gradual resultant of an accumulated experience tending towards justice and peace. It has the tragic sense, the serious attitude towards life struggling for maintenance in a world which has a hard core beneath a deceptively amiable appearance. It upholds the development of self-discipline and self-respect through socially-minded personal conduct. And it perceives the aesthetic effort toward balance and dignity.

Liberalism, on the other hand, is the achievement of a spirituality freed from fear, servility, and desire. Its view of human nature is generous to a fault. Belief in the worth of human personality becomes belief in the inherent goodness of every man and woman; and belief in the wisdom of objective reason leads to a demand for complete freedom of thought and action. Such breadth of conception is magnificent, and the value of its stimulus to our thinking can hardly be overestimated. In scientific experiment, liberal freedom has vastly increased the mechanical utilities of civilization; and in social relations it has widened the field for a great deal of ordinary human happiness.

Such, briefly, is the nature of that opposition which is integral to the democratic process. But orthodox liberalism soon meets with other than conservative criticism: it soon meets the charge that from the paucity of its practical proposals it dooms to futility its own social idealism. Liberalism is, in fact, the strongest proponent of private enterprise in industrial production, of freedom of trade and freedom of investment. And harsh experience soon proved that complete freedom in those fields jeopardized social peace by widening the spread between riches and poverty. The Liberals could think of no adequate reply.

But in many minds, constructive imagination is stimulated by adverse circumstances. Every difficulty or pain, whether personal or vicarious, induces a search for ameliorative or remedial measures. Such people may be troublesome, but they are truly the pioneers of civilized life. They dream: and they urge that reality be seized and moulded nearer to their dream. Among them are the crassest bigots and doctrinaires, propounding over-simple schemes of taxation, distribution, monetary sleight-of-hand, or what not. But among them, also, are practical thinkers and organizers. Men of this radical temperament have reformed education and jurisprudence. They have initiated powerful workers' associations: trade unions, consumers' cooperative societies, and Socialist parties.

In terms of the popular figure of partisan arrangement, this movement represents "an extension to the left." Actually, it is something more, for a break with the economic system of private capitalism is implied. Yet politically the movement is continuous. Practicable social reform works from a basis of honest criticism and creative foresight. Socialism itself is an English conception, its first concrete expression the King's Highway, a public construction for the use of all the citizens. In our democratic world the most valuable properties are already socialist in character—for example, libraries, schools, parks, sanitation utilities, highways.

So aspiration is lifted to a new level. The central desire of Socialism is for a balanced, self-regulating order of society, engaging the social impulses and insights of men and women in a natural fashion—that is, with a minimum of organized force. A vital recognition of the common needs is involved—home, nutrition, cultural opportunity, leisure, creative work. Instead of the domination of capitalist requirements, its proposed means are the cooperation of individuals and groups, and belief in the value of life and its purposes.

A peculiar distortion was given to this way of thinking by the fiery genius of Marx. Steeped in German mysticism, he preached that social progress was implicit in a blind play of historical forces and was produced by a series of cataclysms. A sort of fatalism seemed implied. But astute politicians made use of the messianic hopes aroused among the propertyless masses, and organized in Germany, France, and Italy parties which became "the extreme left" of the parliamentary arc.

Faced with this spirit of revolt, and with the evidence that *laissez-faire* had resulted, not in international peace and free trade, but in imperialism and monopoly, Liberalism as a political force disintegrated. Asquith, its last great leader, instituted important social reforms for England, but elsewhere its idealism degenerated into shallow optimism and peace-at-any-price. Left-liberalism became a byword for wishful thinking, evasion, complaisance, and truckling.

Meanwhile its tougher element compromised with nationalist sentiment. In Europe and the British Dominions, National Liberalism manipulated protective tariffs, favored the export of merchandise, condoned chauvinism, and took a firm stand against labor. In terms of the popular figure, this was "an extension to the right." But lacking the philosophy of either conservatives or the older liberals, without the feeling of

either Socialists or genuine nationalists, this movement was nothing but sheer opportunism.

Nationalism, by comparison, fills an authentic human want. The cult of patriotism, it is the political organization of man's natural love for the land of his birth, his tribal relations, and the literature of his mother tongue. It engages the instinct of piety, a longing for unity with the very sources of being. Surely an innocent content. Yet the consolidation of the geographic and economic foundations of a people can mean war. The liberation of "blood brothers" from foreign rule means war. This party stands, then, at the "extreme right" of the parliamentary arc.

Marxism and Nationalism are the two extremes,—literally, and in two aspects. Extension beyond them is impossible within the limits of civilized discussion, for their passions are at the explosion point. An extension beyond them is therefore a break with parliament. Secondly, there are no further elements for assimilation into consistent political ideologies. The extremes can now only borrow or steal from each other, veer about in their direction, and meet in another world of their own making.

The Russian Marxists split over the question of taking state power: while the parliamentarians were willing to await the conversion of the electorate, the Bolshevik faction decided upon imposition by violence. Both claimed support from holy writ, but Lenin's party had the advantage in its unscrupulous enlistment of Russian terrorist tradition and its demagogic exploitation of the agrarian revolt. Peasant interests were accommodated disingenuously. The central aim was social justice for one class only—the urban manual workers. Hence totalitarian revolution to destroy a whole era of aristocratic and bourgeois expansion, and to establish a new worker's era. Hence the rule of one party and the destruction of democracy. Such a form of Socialism could be but transitory in any country. But the Bolsheviks did experiment boldly, and in a spirit of extremely generous optimism.

Bolshevism had been impressed by the discipline and efficiency of the Prussian army; its borrowed elements therefore included a concept of the state as the only proper agency of social direction. To the contrary, Fascism had its very roots in statist theories, while its borrowings were from labor. Nationalism, gone crazy under D'Annunzio, conjoined with state worship and syndicalist direct action under Mussolini to produce a caricature of patriotism and a cruel simulacrum of economic security. And Fascism was a second repudiation of democracy. In Italy, the *Camorra* has had a long tradition; and it was this form of gangster organization that Fascism carried into complete control of the nation, forcing business associations, trade unions, and cultural expression alike into one mould of totalitarian uniformity.

In Russia, the tyranny of Stalin succeeded the period of Bolshevik experiment and the New Economic Policy. Despite the stultifying tergiversation of foreign apologists, this was counter-revolution. The Marxist intelligentsia and army staff were massacred, the party itself was reconstituted, and a new ruling class of bureaucrats and industrial managers supplanted the workers as the beneficiaries of the regime. Russian peasant revolts had always been characterized by lack of principle or conscious goals, their vague utopianism a compound of primitive gregariousness and mob violence. Russian central government had always been a matter of repressive police power. These elemental and recalcitrant forces effectively smothered the leaven of socialist intention, and the whole direction was a plunge deeper into "permanent despotism."

In Germany, the National Revolutionaries under the tyranny of Hitler speedily overtook the Fascism of Southern Europe. This development was no part of capitalist economy. In part it was a reversion to the barbarism of ancient Prussia, a deliberate rejection of all cultural values. In part it was a rising of gangsters from the urban underworld, racketeering parasites seizing power at the top. The outcome was a ruthless exploitation of both men and industry for the destruction of Western civilization. Nationalist fury was carried to the extreme where other peoples could be described as inferior species to be exterminated. From the other end, the class hatreds of Marxism were utilized by an unscrupulous demagogy. The pact of August, 1939, thus symbolized the closing of a circuit.

The main features of the new political world created by the modern tyrannies are now clearly discernible. Fundamentally, a cult of emotionalism displaces the appeal to reason. Debate and persuasion are abolished, and public opinion is managed through a combination of propaganda and terror. Fundamental also is the repudiation of universal ethics. All this implies a conception of man as a brute requiring to be beaten into submission and obedience by an arbitrary power. Hence the determining organization of the *Camorra,* with its relentless subordination to a rigid hierarchy. Hence the dependence upon a secret political police and an international system of agitators and saboteurs. The final outcome is a repudiation of social motives in favor of power as such.

So the image suggested by this survey of present political facts is that of a ring having three segments. The totalitarian world is one segment. The democratic world is two. And it is the obstinate dispute within democracy between bourgeois and radical which is the root cause of its weakness in the face of despotism. It remains a vital truth that democracy requires the play of dialectics. But today the proper center of that play is shifting. The economy of private capitalism is moribund, and the sooner its political factions give up the ghost, the sooner can democracy rally its inherent forces in the ultimate crisis.

For our hope, there rises in Western Europe a new party, which promises to take over from Conservatism the valid points of its argument, while offering to provide with Socialism the necessary mutuality of orderly discussion between opposing and yet complimentary views. For its social inspiration, Christian Democracy can claim an illustrious lineage, including the names of More and Wyclif. Yet it is a newly aroused force, springing from the ashes of defeat in Italy, France, and South Germany. It has experienced immediately the terrible threat of despotism to every religious purpose; it has experienced the futility of reliance upon a benevolent capitalism. The rights of labor are conceded; the need for social control of monopolistic enterprise is recognized. But the strongest point in Catholic, if not in Protestant, thought is a clear distinction between society and the state. Society in this view must be a multitude of persons and a grouping of groups. Christian Democracy is imbued with the spirit of Acton's justly famous epigram: "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

For its own part, Social Democracy appears to be

coming into its inheritance, holding now the dominant political position in Britain, Scandinavia, and the Antipodes, with a respectable position also in the Low Countries. In so far as it abjures the frivolities of decadent liberalism and the temptations of Marxism, it revitalizes its own message and its purposes. It promises to take over the heart of liberal idealism—an important function if the humanistic values derived from the Renaissance and the Enlightenment are to be preserved. Its own message, however, is a contribution to that redefinition of the nature of man which must unite at bottom the parties of the future. Man is a social being, willing to share with his fellows. Man has a free spirit which resists the imposition of violence. When the Christian observes that man is also self-willed and perverse, mere denial is foolish. Both can agree that man is radically generous and capable of regeneration.

We can see, then, the antitheses of the ultimate political crisis as Freedom and Power. The problem involved here is not always recognized. It is not recognized at all by the despot, by his sycophants or his dupes, because they deny freedom, believing only in power and its converse, servile obedience. The democrat, on the other hand, feels compelled to seek freedom, which demands a synthesis. Hence his difficulties. It is a complication of his problem that individual freedom must be found within society.

The Study Table

Dante in America

DANTE'S AMERICAN PILGRIMAGE. *By Angelina La Piana. New Haven: Yale University Press. 310 pp. $4.00.*

Wellesley College and the Yale University Press have done a great service to American literature in publishing this important book. Dr. La Piana has traced the history of American translations and criticism of Dante from 1800 to 1944. This book is, however, more than a historical survey; it shows why Dante and medievalism have appealed so strongly to American scholars. The trend of Dante research from the first American translation by Thomas W. Parsons, of Boston, in 1843, has steadily moved forward with that of literary criticism. The author's discussions of Lowell's and especially Emerson's criticism of Dante are important as both these writers have been misunderstood and misrepresented. The discussion of Dante as a forerunner of the Reformation will interest a large number of persons and should provoke considerable comment. The present reviewer would like to suggest Francis of Assisi together with Dante in this respect. Some student of the Middle Ages should make a new appraisal of this aspect of Church History which is in reality a part of the literary history of the human spirit. Neither Dante nor Francis ever thought of separating religion from poetry or from literature in general. Let us all learn that they cannot be separated. Today there is a renewed interest in medievalism. Protestant theological schools are adding to their curricula courses in this direction, and reviewing again Parson's belief that "Dante was indeed an earlier Luther." It is worthy of note that two eminent Dante scholars were Protestant theologians: Marvin R. Vincent of Union Theological Seminary, and Charles Allen Dinsmore of Yale Divinity School. An interesting story connected with the translation of Dante by Professor Melville Anderson of Stanford University, which Dr. La Piana does not tell, concerns his friendship with the naturalist John Muir. In the period when Muir was writing in the interest of preserving the natural beauty of the Rockies, his friend, Professor Anderson, was in Italy working on his translation of Dante. Fearing he could not find a publisher for his ambitious project, he wrote Muir about his anxiety. Muir, who was much interested in Dante, replied at once that he would "gladly bear all the expense" of the publication. All scholars are indebted to Dr. La Piana for this excellent study. Let us hope she will continue to give us more books dealing with the period of Dante in which she is an eminent authority.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Jewish History

A HISTORY OF THE JEWS. *By Solomon Grayzel. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society. 835 pp. $3.50.*

THE RELIGIOUS PILGRIMAGE OF ISRAEL. *By I. G. Matthews. New York: Harper & Bros. $4.00.*

We have had volumes by the score these years setting forth the significance of the Jewish contribution to Western civilization; what we need even more are books such as this one by Solomon Grayzel in which the long history of the Jewish people is allowed to speak for itself, to plead its own *raison d'etre,* and to argue its own case for justice to the Jew. Among recent histories of the Jews, this volume will occupy a place of honor and distinction. It is done by a historian who brings to his task not only erudition and expert scholarship but also imagination and felicity of style. This reviewer wishes that this volume might find its way into the library of every parson and into every Christian college and seminary library as well, to supply there the woeful need of books on Jewish subjects and especially on Jewish history.

At a time when the fate of the Jewish people is again so intimately linked with the problems of international security, justice, and peace, a well-written, well-documented, and wisely interpreted history of Israel should render a great service to the cause of truth without which justice and peace are impossible. Dr. Grayzel will be welcomed by both scholars and the general public as a wise teacher, a reliable guide, and a friendly counsellor.

It is easy to agree enthusiastically with all that ex-

perts in the realm of Old Testament lore have said in praise of the latest book by I. G. Matthews, Professor Emeritus of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis in Crozer Theological Seminary. Dr. Matthews has here brought together the full fruitage of his many years of scholarship, research, and teaching in the particular field he has served so well. But having granted all this, it is still entirely apropos to make this fundamental criticism. Namely, that the book is not what it presumes to be, i.e., the record of "The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel." This title cannot but give an erroneous impression and perpetuate the ancient bias that Israel's religious life and experience ended with the closing of the Old Testament canon, and that thereafter the religious genius of this great people went into a Rip Van Winkle slumber from which it never awoke. Without disagreeing with more than a few individual interpretations of the distinguished author, this reviewer feels it necessary to point out the old and popular error that Dr. Matthews here makes in perpetuating the fallacious and entirely unfounded impression that there is nothing more to the religious pilgrimage of Israel than what we find recorded in the Tanach, i.e., the Hebrew Bible, and in certain extra-canonical writings that had appeared at the beginning of our common era.

What Dr. Matthews says about the religious Odyssey of the genius of Israel up to this time may be largely granted as being scholarly, accurate, and generally acceptable as to interpretation, but to stop there is to do violence to history and to the Judaic tradition. It is undoubtedly true that the thousand or more years that saw the growth of Old Testament life and faith must be reckoned as vitally significant in the religious pilgrimage of Israel. But to these thousand years must be added the tragedy of the following two thousand years of Jewish Diaspora experience, in the course of which the religious genius of Israel indeed preserved its ancient heritage, but also added thereto, amplified, and elaborated it, and in a manner nothing short of providential grew in stature as a people and as a religious culture whose march through the ages goes on and whose religious pilgrimage will not find goal or rest until the day when "justice will roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream."

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.

Cartoons for Grownups, Too

IN HENRY'S BACK YARD. *By Ruth Benedict and Gene Weltfish. New York: Henry Schuman, Inc. $2.00.*

This is an amazing book based on the author's study *The Races of Mankind.* First, the idea behind that book was made into a cartoon-movie called "Brotherhood of Man." Henry was the star of that picture.

Now comes a book of colored cartoons. Honest to goodness, they are entertaining and carry a punch. It is a book for the whole family.

Henry had a wonderful dream. He dreamed that the whole world was living in his own back yard. When he awoke the next morning, he looked out of the window, and, lo, it was true! Reader, take it from there. Be sure to read it; and give it to the boys and girls—and grownups—especially to grownups.

JAMES M. YARD.

Books Received

AMERICAN OVERTURE. *By Abram Vossen Goodman. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 281 pp. $3.00.*

AND SO YOU NEVER PRAY. *By Horace Westwood. Boston: The Beacon Press. 148 pp. $1.75.*

THE ART OF STAYING SANE. *By Joseph Barth. Boston: The Beacon Press. 192 pp. $2.00.*

MR. BENJAMIN'S SWORD. *By Robert D. Abrahams. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 183 pp. $2.00.*

THE CASE OF THE NAZARENE REOPENED. *By Hyman E. Goldin. New York: The Exposition Press. 863 pp. $5.00.*

CHRISTIANITY. *By Charles Edwards Park. Boston: The Beacon Press. 121 pages. $1.75.*

CONVERSATIONS ON SUCCESS IN MARRIAGE. *By Napoleon W. Lovely. Boston: The Beacon Press. 62 pp. $1.50.*

THE HOUSE OF NASI: DONA GRACIA. *By Cecil Roth. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 208 pp. $3.00.*

JESUS, JEWS AND GENTILES. *By Benjamin Danniel. New York: Arco Publishing Company. 239 pp. $3.00.*

MAGIC, SCIENCE AND RELIGION. *By Bronislaw Malinowski. Boston: The Beacon Press. 327 pp. $3.50.*

THE QUAKER MESSAGE. *Compiled by Sidney Lucas. Wallingford, Pa.: Pendle Hill. 90 pp. Twenty-five Cents.*

NOT AS THE WORLD GIVETH. *By Philippe Vernier. New York: Fellowship Publications. 96 pp. $1.50.*

A MESSAGE TO ATHEISTS. *By Dana McLean Greeley. Boston: The Beacon Press. 145 pp. $2.00.*

MORE THAN WE ARE. *By Margueritte Harmon Bro. New York: Harper & Bros. 144 pp. $1.50.*

RELIGION THROUGH THE AGES. *Edited by Hermon F. Bell and Charles Macfarland. New York: Philosophical Library. 455 pp. $5.00.*

THEY SAW GANDHI. *By John S. Hoyland. New York: Fellowship Publications. 102 pp. $1.75.*

TWO GIANTS AND ONE WORLD. *By A. William Loos. New York: Friendship Press. 96 pp.*

WHAT IS HAPPENING IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION. *By Raymond B. Johnson. Boston: The Beacon Press. 88 pp. $1.50.*

Tide of Bayonets

I see a rising tide of bayonets
Run through the dark, and seeing what I fear
I make it so, for evil castanets
Of war will never play themselves, no spear
Exists without a hand to give it hate;
Without man's fear the dark would bare no steel;
Catastrophe is not a yield of fate—
Man harvests dangers that world strangers feel.

Can I dream of faces in the dark,
Of walking neighbors holding empty hands?
The people of the world are thin and stark—
Until old fears have tied them up in bands.
The people of the world are small and kind
Until they yield to Captains of the Blind.

MANFRED A. CARTER.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

RECORD GENEVA CONFERENCE

All attendance records were broken at the 1948 Unitarian Summer Assembly held at College Camp, Wisconsin, August 22 to 29. Five hundred and eleven different people were registered for a day or more. Four hundred and eight were there for the full seven days. The week end brought an overflow crowd which necessitated putting up an extra table in the entranceway of the dining room.

The weather was warm and humid but beautiful Lake Geneva was cool and refreshing. The morale of the group was excellent, the lectures and classes exceptional and well attended. From the 7:45 breakfast hour to the breakup of the midnight bull sessions people were learning and discussing, making and renewing friendships, working and relaxing. The Conference moved through the week with efficiency and effectiveness. The "Farewells 'till next year" came all too soon.

DREIKURS A HIT

Dr. Rudolf Dreikurs, well-known Chicago psychiatrist, gave the morning lectures for the adult division of the Conference. Dreikurs was a hit. Speaking to some two hundred people each morning on the general theme of "The Challenge of Living," Dr. Dreikurs dealt with the tensions that individuals face in living in modern society, the cultural patterns which create them, and what the individual can do about them. This series of lectures was informational, inspirational, and practical all at the same time. He also conducted a seminar on marriage relations for the College group.

SUCCESSFUL INNOVATION

Something new was added Saturday night. Mr. John Greene, Bass-Baritone, gave a concert accompanied by Mrs. Marion Bloch. His performance was outstanding and the audience was enthusiastic in its reception of the program. Mr. Greene is Director of the Cultural Arts Department of Abraham Lincoln Centre.

WHO IS TENSE?

Dr. Curtis W. Reese presented his four lectures on "Unitarian Tensions Today" with such clarity and cogency that most people were convinced that the position he took was right, or at least there was little inclination to argue about it. These lectures and discussions certainly demonstrated that the "unity of spirit" was predominant over any diversity of opinion. Dr. Reese dealt with four areas of Unitarian polity. They were "Unitarian Advance," "The Christian Register," "Social Action," and "The Humanist-Theist Controversy." There was some revealing, if not startling, information obtained from the discussion. Nearly three-fourths of the people admitted that they had never heard of the Unitarian Advance Program. A like number indicated that they had heard of the *Christian Register* issue, but it appeared that devoid of personalities there was little concern about it. In so far as Social Action and Humanism were concerned, the people at Geneva had no serious objections to either of them. This does not mean that there was no discussion. As a result of the presentation of the Advance issues, two extra bull sessions were held dealing with the "Five Points." The discussions and "bull sessions" were conducted by Dr. Merrill Bush, Director of the Department of Adult Education and Social Relations for the American Unitarian Association.

ABLE PINCH HITTERS

Mrs. Reginald Manwell was scheduled to give two courses: "The Psychological Development of the Growing Child" and "Primary Methods and Materials." Word came during the summer that due to illness Mrs. Manwell would not be able to attend. At the last minute, Dr. Merrill Bush agreed to give a course on "Adolescent Psychology," and Miss Mary Milner, of St. Louis, agreed to teach one on "Junior Methods and Materials." In order that those who had come to the Conference especially to get help in the Primary Department would not be disappointed, Miss Frances Wood, Director of the Leadership Training Department of the Division of Education, gave a special seminar course in this field. This she did in addition to her duties as Director of the Adult Division of the Conference and her class in Church School Administration.

Mr. Edward Darling, the jovial and genial News Editor of the *Christian Register,* led the Laymen's Seminar. Six days were spent in discussing the problems of public relations and publicity in the local church. Mr. Darling agreed to do this after Mr. William Roger Greeley found that he would be unable to attend.

ALL-STARS

Space does not permit detailing all of the highlights. Dr. Charles Lyttle's novel, intriguing, and interesting approach to the History of Unitarianism, Robert Weston's expurgated story of the Nativity, John Gill's forcing the ministers to think, Dr. Reginald Manwell's Bible for the high school student, Lois McColloch and Mrs. Pieksen giving the Alliance a vision for the future, demonstrated that this was a faculty of All-Stars accounting for the intensity of the enthusiasm and high morale which existed.

SERVICE COMMITTEE

Dr. Raymond B. Bragg, Director of the Unitarian Service Committee, spoke on Friday night in behalf of the work of this outstanding Unitarian contribution. In response to Dr. Bragg's presentation an offering was taken for the Service Committee which resulted in the Conference sending three hundred and fifty dollars to the Committee.

YOUTH IS SERVED AND SERVES

One hundred and sixteen young people, almost equally divided between boys and girls and between high school and college ages, enjoyed an exciting and profitable week. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., minister of the Unitarian church in Rockford, Illinois, was the director of the Youth program. Workshops and Study Groups were set up for high school and college ages. Just to name the leaders participating in this dual program indicates another All-Star faculty. The leaders were Dr. Dreikurs, Homer A. Jack, Robert Sorenson, Kenneth Patton, Dr. Bush, Dr. James Luther Adams, Mr. Clifton Hoffman, new Director of Youth Education for the American Unitarian Association; Rev. William P. Jenkins, minister of the Unitarian Church, Toronto, Canada; John Hayward, Robert Weston, and Mrs. Mildred Dewey.

The excellent work which the young people did in publishing the *Geneva Advance,* the daily mimeographed paper, deserves special mention. It was out on time each day. They also published a complete mailing list of the Conference as it stood on Friday night. Full credit and praise should be given to Nancy Jack, the Editor, and her staff, and to Dorothy Angell, Publication Director.

EXPERIMENT

The Junior High Camp which was undertaken this year for the first time, at the request of and with the assistance of the Division of Education, was a real success. Mrs. Dudley Moore, Director of Education for the Unitarian Church in Detroit, was the Junior High Camp Director. She was ably assisted by Miss Mary Milner, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Renneker of Detroit, and Mr. Joseph Tanaka of St. Louis.

One of the outstanding contributions to the whole Conference was provided by the Junior High Camp. On Friday they visited the Abraham Lincoln Centre Camp at Milton Junction, Wisconsin, and invited the Centre Camp to return the visit on Saturday. This they did. The Junior Hi-ers secured the cooperation of the high school and college groups in this enterprise.

The Geneva Board has requested Mrs. Moore to conduct the Junior High Camp again next year if it can secure the cooperation of the Division of Education.

WORSHIP

Each day was brought to a close by firelight services. The young people held theirs in Happy Hollow and the adults met at the lake front on Villa Lawn. Dr. Tracy Pullman of Detroit conducted the lake front firelight services. He presented an exceptional group of readings and meditations dealing with our basic beliefs.

At the Sunday morning service Dr. Preston Bradley, minister of the People's Church, Chicago, preached to a packed auditorium. He spoke on the subject "Religion in the Modern World." This was the final service of the conference.

ADMINISTRATION

The smoothness with which the Conference functioned was due primarily to the excellence of the administrative staff which assisted the Dean. The three Divisional Directors, Miss Frances Wood, Jack Mendelsohn, and Mrs. Dudley Moore, handled their divisions with exceptional skill. Mrs. Bernard Heinrich, Registrar, dealt with expertness and friendliness with the most difficult task assigned to any one individual. The Public Relations officers, W. A. Hambley, Robert Sorensen, and Howard Hauze, did their work quietly and effectively. Mrs. Carl A. Schaad conducted the Conference Office with ease and efficiency. Mr. Edward Darling, Book Store Manager, though having fewer selections this year, increased the sales. The recreational program was most ably led by Mrs. Kenneth Casson, Miss Pauline Daly, and Mrs. Richard Kuch.

THE BOARD

Three new members were elected to the Board to serve terms of three years: Mrs. Bernard Heinrich, Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., and Rev. Philip Schug, of Lincoln, Nebraska. At its meeting on Saturday, August 28, the Board reelected its officers: W. A. Hambley, Chairman; Mrs. Randall S. Hilton, Vice-Chairman; Mrs. Bernard Heinrich, Secretary and Registrar; Mr. Fritz Schaefer, Treasurer. Randall S. Hilton was reelected Dean for the coming year.

NEXT YEAR!

Probable dates—August 28 to September 4, 1949.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

NEW UNITARIANS

The two newest Unitarian organizations in the United States were organized during the past few months. The Free Religious Fellowship of Chicago was organized as the newest church last April, with the Reverend Lewis McGee as minister. The church meets in the Y. W. C. A. at 46th Street and South Parkway.

The first of the new lay organizations now being sponsored by the American Unitarian Association was officially organized on June 30th at Boulder, Colorado. It has taken the name of the Unitarian Fellowship of Boulder. The group had been meeting during the past year under the leadership of William Lemon, student at the University of Colorado, and with the assistance of Rev. Rudolph Gilbert of Denver. The president of the new group is Mr. Eugene Hakanson, also a graduate student at the university. Active in forming the group was Col. Albert Bowen (U.S.A. Ret.) who is the grandson of Dr. Newton Mann, well-known Unitarian minister.

DAVENPORT

Rev. Max Gaebler, formerly of Bedford, Massachusetts, arrived to undertake the active ministry of the Davenport church on August 1st.

URBANA

Rev. Arnold Westwood, formerly of Brewster, Massachusetts, began his duties as minister of the Urbana church on August 1st.

HINSDALE

Rev. Raymond B. Palmer assumed his duties as minister of the Unitarian Church of Hinsdale on September 1st. In addition Mr. Palmer is a Professor of Philosophy at Roosevelt College, Chicago.

RESIGNATIONS

The following ministers resigned their pulpits during the summer: Helgi Borgford (Chicago, Beverly), John Malick (Duluth), and Harold Marley (Dayton).

MRS. SOUTHWORTH

Word has been received of the death, in Washington, D. C., on August 24th, of Mrs. Alice B. Southworth, widow of the late Dr. Franklin C. Southworth, former president of the Meadville Theological School. She was eighty-five years of age. Mrs. Southworth was a graduate of Vassar College and later was on the faculty as a professor of Latin. She is survived by two sons, Constant Southworth, Washington, D. C., and Dr. F. Chester Southworth of Buffalo, N. Y.

Dr. Franklin C. Southworth died in 1944. He was president of the Meadville Theological School for twenty-seven years (1902-1929), and was instrumental in moving the school from Meadville, Pennsylvania, to Chicago.

ROCKFORD

During the past year the choir of the Rockford Unitarian Church has been under the leadership of the conductor of the Rockford Symphony Orchestra. During the summer the choir met regularly and was augmented in numbers. It appeared three times with the Rockford Symphony and presented the oratorio "Elijah" at the Rockford Unitarian Church.